

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the attention accorded the present application in the March 2, 2000 Office Action and the courtesy of the interview on May 11, 2000 where a draft of new claim 14 was presented. By the foregoing amendment, claims 1-13 have been cancelled and new claims 14-24 have been added. Accordingly, claims 14-24 are currently pending.

Drawing Objections

Applicants respectfully submit that proposed drawing corrections are not required in this response. Since the only drawing objections to date are those raised by the Office Draftsperson on the PTO-948, Applicants request to defer the submission of formal drawings until after a Notice of Allowance is received. *See* MPEP § 608.02(q).

The Rejection of claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,016,484 to Williams, et al. ("Williams"). It is respectfully noted that Williams, which issued on January 18, 2000, serves as an improper basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

To the extent that Williams might still be applied to new claims 14-24, it is respectfully traversed. In claim 14 (the single independent claim), applicants claim the following method steps:

| |
|---|
| exchanging first data from a local portion of the virtual wallet into a point of sale device wherein the first data includes a transactional amount |
| receiving at a server portion of the virtual wallet an electronic voucher indicative of the electronic good purchased at the point of sale device |
| storing the electronic voucher at the server portion of the virtual wallet |
| receiving a request for the electronic voucher at the server portion of the virtual wallet |
| and providing the electronic good to a user upon receipt of the electronic voucher |

It is respectfully submitted that Williams does not anticipate nor make obvious claim

14. Williams lacks any teaching of purchases of an electronic good where the local wallet portion is synchronized with the server wallet portion, updating the server-based and local-based data in the manner detailed in claim 14. *Compare, e.g., Williams, col. 11, lines 35-67, with Applicants' spec. p. 11, lines 14-16 and lines 27-29; p. 13, lines 11-13.*

Because claims 15-24 depend from claim 14, the foregoing discussion of claim 14 is equally applicable to claims 15-24.

Serial No. 09/190,993
Docket No. CITI0094

The Rejection of claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Williams in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,880 to Biffar. Claims 12 and 13 have been cancelled. New claims 23 and 24 roughly parallel cancelled claims 12 and 13. Because claims 23 and 24 depend from claim 14, the foregoing discussion of claim 14 is equally applicable to claims 23 and 24.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 14-24, for the reasons presented above, patentably distinguish the present invention from the cited references. Allowance of claims 14-24 is therefore respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary other than the issuance of a Notice of Allowance, he is encouraged to telephone Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Cris T. PALTENGHE et al.

Date: 7/3/00

By: for Ball #44,433
George T. Marcou
Registration No. 33,014

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
Suite 800
700 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 508-5800